

REMARKS

In the Official Action Dated March 17, 2009, the Office rejected various claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In this paper, Applicants have responded to each of the claim rejections. All amendments have been made to place the claims in condition for allowance.

For purposes of expediting prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claim 32 without prejudice, and amended claims 9 and 30. Applicants have also withdrawn claims 10-18 as being directed to a non-elected invention.

These amendments are all supported by the specification as filed. No new matter has been added. Applicants preserve the right to file continuing patent applications on any subject matter that has been cancelled from the claims, including any cancelled claims.

Claim Objections

The office objected to claim 9 because it depends on cancelled claim 8.

In response to this claim objection, Applicants have amended claim 9 to make claim 9 an independent claim. Accordingly, this objection has been obviated and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

The office objected to claim 30, alleging compounds 16 and 57 in Table 3 are directed to non-elected subject matter, and that Table 3 should have a period at the end.

In response to this claim objection, Applicants have deleted compounds 16 and 57 in Table 3 without prejudice. In addition, Applicants have put a period after the very last compound in Table 3, and Applicants have added semicolons after each compound in Table 3 prior to the last compound. Accordingly, this objection has been obviated and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

The Office rejected claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, alleging that the term "metabolite" is not enabled.

For the sole purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicants have deleted claim 32. Accordingly, this rejection has been obviated. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

The Office rejected claim 9, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, alleging that there is no antecedent basis for variables Y and Z in claim 9.

In response, Applicants have deleted variables Y and Z from 9. Accordingly, this rejection has been obviated. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of this rejection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

No fees are believed to be due in order to process this document and any paper attached. Should the U.S. Patent Office determine that an extension of time and/or other relief is required at this time, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the cost of such relief and/or fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1108, referencing EX04-019C-US.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2009

Robert L. Bernstein

Robert L. Bernstein
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,020

Exelixis, Inc.
210 East Grand Avenue
Post Office Box 511
South San Francisco, CA 94083-0511
Direct Phone: (650) 837-7352
Fax: (650) 837-8234